(c) what is the difference between the status of Chief Justice of High Court and a Justice of Supreme Court?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) The Chief Justice of India had recommended, inter alia, the name of the Chief Justice of Karnataka High Court for appointment as a Judge of the Supreme Court. When complaints against him were received by the Chief Justice of India and the Government, the Chief Justice of India and his Collegium have deferred that recommendation.

(b) Yes, Sir. In the past ten years i.e. from December, 1999 to December 2009, there was one such case.

(c) A Judge of the Supreme Court as well as a Chief Justice of a High Court are appointed as per the provisions of the Constitution of India and discharge their duties and responsibilities as assigned by the Constitution in their respective courts.

Pending cheque bounce cases

3477. SHRI RAJEEV CHANDRASEKHAR: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) the estimated number of pending cheque bounce cases in lower courts, State-wise;

(b) whether Government is considering to set up Fast Track Courts to deal with such cases; and

(c) if so, by when this exercise is likely to be completed?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) Such information is not being maintained centrally.

(b) There is no such proposal at present.

(c) Does not arise.

Grants for Fast Track Courts

3478. SHRI N. R. GOVINDARAJAR: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has discontinued the status of the centrally sponsored scheme for the Fast Track Courts functioning in various States;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the grant to these Courts is very meagre compared to the recurring and non-recurring expenditure; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and the action taken to increase the grant?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) to (d) No, Sir. Government has not discontinued the scheme of central assistance to the states for the Fast Track Courts. In fact, while extending the scheme for a period of five years beyond 31.3.2005, Government

enhanced central assistance for non-recurring expenditure and made a provision for an additional amount of Rs. 8.60 lakh per court being given to the States for the first two years after 31.3.2005.

Central assistance to the States under the scheme is provided on the basis of the approved norm i.e. Rs. 4.80 lakh per court per annum towards the recurring expenditure. Some of the States have reported expenditure in excess of the assistance provided to them. The central assistance released to the States and the expenditure incurred by them during the year 2007-08 is given in the Statement (*See* below).

There is no proposal at present to increase the rate of central assistance to the States for the Fast Track Courts.

Statement

State-wise Central grant released and actual expenditure incurred by the States during 2007-08 under the scheme of Fast Track Courts

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of States	Central Grant released	Expenditure incurred by the States
1	2	3	4
1	Andhra Pradesh	412.80	568.58
2	Arunachal Pradesh	14.40	22.07
3	Assam	96.00	136.58
4	Bihar	720.00	1238.60
5	Chhattisgarh	129.60	247.95
6	Goa	24.00	75.67
7	Gujarat	571.20	1006.89 *
8	Haryana	67.20	138.00
9	Himachal Pradesh	0	Not received
10	Jharkhand	190.17	426.63
11	Karnataka	230.40	598.90
12	Kerala	148.80	563.85
13	Madhya Pradesh	259.80	522.11
14	Maharashtra	782.40	2232.23
15	Manipur	9.60	17.14
16	Meghalaya	0	20.70
17	Mizoram	14.40	14.40
18	Nagaland	9.60	9.60

1	2	3	4
19	Orissa	158.40	300.69
20	Punjab	51.20	117.64
21	Rajasthan	398.40	1232.17
22	Tamil Nadu	235.20	634.87
23	Tripura	0	8.30
24	Uttar Pradesh	495.52	1258.00
25	Uttaranchal	129.60	70.82
26	West Bengal	571.20	1662.01
	TOTAL	5719.89	13124.40

* Expenditure from April, 2007 to September 2007.

Changes in personal laws

3479. SHRI ABDUL WAHAB PEEVEE: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Law Commission has recommended changes in the existing matrimonial laws and make conversions illegal and punishable; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) and (b) The 18th Law Commission headed by Justice A.R. Lakshmanan examined the existing legal position of bigamy in India and suggested ways to check the social malaise of bigamy through the route of sham conversion in its 227th Report on 'Preventing Bigamy via Conversion to Islam - A Proposal for giving Statutory Effect to Supreme Court Rulings'. The said Report has been laid on the Table of House on 14.12.2009 and also available on the website of the Law Commission http://www.lawcommissionofindia.nic.in

Review of Judges Inquiry Act

3480. SHRI O.T. LEPCHA:
DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA A. HEPTULLA:
SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA:
Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government intends to review the Judges Inquiry Act in view of a long and cumbersome procedure prescribed in the Act;

(b) if so, by when;

(c) the status of inquiry initiated against Justice Saumitra Sen of Kolkata High Court;